



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.						
10/721,728	11/25/2003	Christian J. Lee	CR30Q-US	5766						
60/723 AVON PRODUCTS, INC. AVON PLACE SUFFERN, NY 10501	7590 08/06/2009		EXAMINER MERCIER, MELISSA S							
		<table border="1"><tr><td>ART UNIT</td><td>PAPER NUMBER</td><td></td></tr><tr><td></td><td>1615</td><td></td></tr></table>			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER			1615	
ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER									
	1615									
		<table border="1"><tr><td>NOTIFICATION DATE</td><td>DELIVERY MODE</td></tr><tr><td>08/06/2009</td><td>ELECTRONIC</td></tr></table>			NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE	08/06/2009	ELECTRONIC		
NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE									
08/06/2009	ELECTRONIC									

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

PATENT.DEPARTMENT@AVON.COM

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b> 10/721,728	<b>Applicant(s)</b> LEE ET AL.
	<b>Examiner</b> Melissa S. Mercier	<b>Art Unit</b> 1615

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --  
**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
  - If no period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
  - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED. (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

#### **Status**

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 24 November 2006 and 31 July 2007.
- 2a) This action is FINAL.      2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

#### **Disposition of Claims**

- 4) Claim(s) 1-28 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) 14-28 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 1-13 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

#### **Application Papers**

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

#### **Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) All    b) Some \* c) None of:
1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

#### **Attachment(s)**

- 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_
- 4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_
- 5) Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) Other: \_\_\_\_\_

**DETAILED ACTION**

***Election/Restrictions***

Applicant's election with traverse of Group I in the reply filed on July 31, 2007 is acknowledged. The traversal is on the ground(s) that searching all claims together is not a search burden on the examiner. This is not found persuasive because restriction for examination purposes as indicated is proper because all these inventions listed in this action are independent or distinct for the reasons given above and there would be a serious search and examination burden if restriction were not required because one or more of the following reasons apply:

- (a) the inventions have acquired a separate status in the art in view of their different classification;
- (b) the inventions have acquired a separate status in the art due to their recognized divergent subject matter;
- (c) the inventions require a different field of search (for example, searching different classes/subclasses or electronic resources, or employing different search queries);
- (d) the prior art applicable to one invention would not likely be applicable to another invention;
- (e) the inventions are likely to raise different non-prior art issues under 35 U.S.C. 101 and/or 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph.

Claims 14-28 are withdrawn from further consideration pursuant to 37 CFR 1.142(b), as being drawn to a nonelected groups and species, there being no allowable generic or linking claim.

The requirement is still deemed proper and is therefore made FINAL.

However, after further consideration of the species requirement, the examiner has withdrawn the requirement and both species of polyurethane will be examined together.

***Priority***

Applicant's claim of priority as a CIP to Application 09/714,715 filed on November 16, 2000 is acknowledged. However, due to Applicants expansion of the glass transition temperature to -40C, Applicant is not entitled to the priority date for claims 1-5 and 7-13.

***Information Disclosure Statement***

The listing of references in the specification is not a proper information disclosure statement. 37 CFR 1.98(b) requires a list of all patents, publications, or other information submitted for consideration by the Office, and MPEP § 609.04(a) states, "the list may not be incorporated into the specification but must be submitted in a separate paper." Therefore, unless the references have been cited by the examiner on form PTO-892, they have not been considered.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham v. John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

Claims 1-13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Farer et al. (US Patent 6,156,325) in view of Kane International Disclosure of KFilm 2071, 2072, and 2073 (see attached).

Farer discloses a nail enamel composition comprising film forming substances, including nitrocellulose, as a primary film former, and polyurethane, as a secondary film former. Film forming substances are present in the amount of 5-20% by weight relative to the weight of the composition. Modifiers for the primary film forming agent include aryl sulfonamide resins, including epoxy resins (column 4, lines 11-33).

Plasticizers are also present in the amount of 3-12% of the formulation (column 4, lines 34-49).

Solvents are present in the amount of 40-80% by weight relative to the total weight of the composition (column 4, lines 57-60).

Coloring agents can also be added (column 4, lines 61-65).

Farer does not disclose the high molecular weight and glass transition temperature of the polyurethane in the instant claims.

Kane International has been marketing the high molecular weight polyurethane resins disclosed in the instant specification, known as KFilm 2071, 2072, and 2073 since 1984 according to the manufacturer who was contacted by the Examiner on July 30, 2009. Applicant has indicated that the resins meet the functional limitations of the instant claims. Applicant has further identified these resins by Trade name in the specification indicating they were commercially available prior to the filling date of the invention.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to have used the KFilm products in the composition of Farer since Kane International discloses that they are excellent film forming resins having excellent adhesion and bond strengths.

***Requirement for Information***

Applicant and the assignee of this application are required under 37 CFR 1.105 to provide the following information that the examiner has determined is reasonably necessary to the examination of this application. The specification on page 6 discloses commercially available high molecular weight polyurethane resins, such as Polyurethane-8; however, the Examiner has been unable to locate such commercially available sources. Applicant is required to provide such information in order for the Examiner to thoroughly search the instant claims including MSDS's, products utilizing such films, manufactures of such films, and the like.

***Double Patenting***

The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. A nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting rejection is appropriate where the conflicting claims are not identical, but at least one examined application claim is not patentably distinct from the reference claim(s) because the examined application claim is either anticipated by, or would have been obvious over, the reference claim(s). See, e.g., *In re Berg*, 140 F.3d 1428, 46 USPQ2d 1226 (Fed. Cir. 1998); *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) or 1.321(d) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent either is shown to be commonly owned with this application, or claims an invention made as a result of activities undertaken within the scope of a joint research agreement.

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

Claims 1-13 are rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-20 of U.S. Patent No. 6,656,483. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because the patented claims comprise a species of the polyurethane resin of the instant claims, namely, the patented claims limit the polyurethane to a polyurethane resin having a weight average molecular weight about 20,000 to about 80,000 and a glass transition temperature of about -4 to -20C, whereas the instant claims expand the range of the glass transition temperature to -4 to -40C. Additionally, the patented claims require the inclusion of one or more arylsulfonamide epoxy resins, however, the instant claims use the terminology comprising allowing for such an inclusion.

### ***Conclusion***

No claims are allowed.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Melissa S. Mercier whose telephone number is (571) 272-9039. The examiner can normally be reached on 7:30am-4pm Mon through Friday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Michael Woodward can be reached on (571) 272-8373. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Melissa S Mercier/  
Examiner, Art Unit 1615

/MP WOODWARD/  
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 1615